



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

instances of late usage in just those portions which earlier critics had been inclined to treat as accretions and interpolations, while the undoubted portions are primitive in grammar and metrical form.

"Reason has been shown," says the author, in the closing chapter, "for believing that these undoubted portions of the poem fall into two sections, originally distinct, the Catalogue of Kings, and the lay of Ealhild and Eormanric which we may regard as the essential *Widsith*. *Widsith*, alike on grounds of legend and geography, cannot be the work of a contemporary of Eadgils and Ealhild who really visited the court of Eormanric. The Catalogue of Kings is older than *Widsith* proper, yet on account of the names it contains it can hardly be earlier than the middle of the sixth century, and may be considerably later. *Widsith* seems to belong to a period later than this, but earlier than *Beowulf* or *Genesis*: that is, to the seventh century."

How far the minuteness of Mr. Chambers' studies have been from blinding him to the literary significance of the poem is well seen in his closing comments on its place in the history of Germanic verse. He feels that it reveals to us "the stock-in-trade of the old Anglian bard," and that "it demonstrates the dignity of the Old English narrative poetry, and of the common Germanic narrative poetry of which the Old English was but a section." Perhaps he is inclined to underrate the seriousness of *Beowulf*, and to over-emphasize the essentially childish *märchen*-plot, but he does not overrate the tragic power of the tales linked with the names of the heroes of *Widsith*. A review of his admirable book may fittingly close with the final sentences, a defence, if any there need be, for such minute and searching labor as his. "In the old heroic poetry we get a glimpse of the thoughts of those men whose unrecorded lives and deaths have done more to the building up of Europe than have the intrigues and quarrels of their lords. This should render sacred not only every recorded line of the old poems, but every paraphrase and every allusion."

WILLIAM WITHERLE LAWRENCE.

Columbia University.

Œuvres de François Rabelais, édition critique publiée par ABEL LEFRANC, JACQUES BOULENGER, HENRI CLOUZOT, PAUL DORVEAUX, JEAN PLATTARD et LAZARE SAINÉAN. Tome premier: *Gargantua* (Prologue—Chapitres I–XXII). Paris, Champion, 1912. clvi + 214 pp.

M. Abel Lefranc is held in grateful remembrance by so many American students of the Romance languages that a book fathered by him is sure to receive a royal welcome in this country. The fine quarto volume before us comprises two diametrically opposed parts. There is, first, in beautiful large print, an *Étude de Gargantua* by M. Lefranc himself, supplemented by two essays, *L'Éducation de Gargantua* and *Thélème*, by M. Plattard, all of which any layman, interested in Rabelais, might read with the greatest of pleasure. The text here given, with its modern punctuation, capitalization and alignment, he might also enjoy reading. On the other hand, there are the voluminous notes in finer print, so voluminous that if read with the text as they are intended to be, running parallel with it, Rabelais himself is quite lost from sight. The reading of Rabelais becomes a study in the history of civilization, in archeology, in philology, in anything but Rabelais as literature. For simple pleasure in Rabelais, in the play of his imagination, in his pithily expressed and wise philosophy, in his marvelous gift of language, we must fall back on our old Burgaud des Marets and Rathery.

The question, therefore, immediately arises why there should be in a scholarly edition the slightest modernization of Rabelais' text. M. Boulenger,¹ after an examination of the ten editions of *Gargantua* that appeared during the life-time of Rabelais, decides that the last edition revised² by Rabelais (E) should form the basis of a critical edition. This text (E) is the same as that published by Marty-Laveaux, but Marty-Laveaux reproduces it with-

¹ Intro., pp. cvii–cxliii.

² Lyon, F. Juste, 1542.

out alteration, claiming that if the original orthography is to be kept, much more should the old punctuation, because the punctuation affects the thought more than the orthography.³ In Rabelais' case at any rate, we are inclined to believe he is right. Compare, if you will, the opening lines of Ch. I. In M. Lefranc's edition we have: "Je vous remectz à la grande chronique Pantagrueline reconnoistre la genealogie et antiquité dont nous est venu Gargantua. En icelle vous entendrez plus au long comment, etc. . . . , et ne vous faschera si pour le present je m'en deporté, combien que la chose soit telle que, tant plus seroit remembrée, tant plus elle plairoit à vos Seigneuries; comme," etc. With the period after *deporté* and *combien* beginning with a capital as in the untampered text, we seem to catch a different impression of the sequence of Rabelais' thought. He seems to say: ". . . and don't be provoked if (therefore) I refrain from giving it now. Although (when I come to think of it) it is a subject," etc. On account of such possible differences in interpretation, it is probable that Marty-Laveaux' edition will still remain indispensable to the student of Rabelais. It is unfortunate that all excellencies cannot be combined, for this new edition has the great advantage over its predecessor in giving all the variants of A, B and D⁴ just below the text, whereas in the edition of Marty-Laveaux, only the important ones are given, and these are hidden in the Commentary in Volume iv.

In *L'Etude de Gargantua*, M. Lefranc gathers the results of all the recent researches upon the subject of Rabelais and his time, and focuses them upon *Gargantua* until the manner and time of its composition and its full significance are more fully revealed to us than ever before. Throughout, no name of place or person is treated lightly. "Quant à Brizepaille," says Marty-Laveaux,⁵ "il faut, je crois, ne point s'évertuer à le chercher sur la carte." Not so M. Lefranc. He not only locates Brise-

paille,⁶ but he is so convinced that Rabelais is building upon personal reminiscences of his youth that he is willing to affirm that "L'orde vieille, venue de Brisepaille d'auprès Saint-Genou, soixante ans auparavant, est sûrement la femme qui assista les accouchées de la famille."⁷ We wonder whether even in the sixteenth century a man of property and importance in the community, such as Rabelais' father,⁸ would employ an "orde vieille" in this capacity. The searching of archives has resulted so successfully in the reconstitution of Gargantua as a tale woven by Rabelais out of real stuff that almost with surprise we read later on in the notes that there still remain a few names "*qu'il est apparemment inutile de chercher à identifier*."⁹

In the interesting discussion of the various Gargantua stories and their relation to Rabelais' work, the conclusion reached does not differ greatly from that of Marty-Laveaux. M. Lefranc is somewhat more reluctant to allow that Rabelais had any part in the edition of the *Grandes et inestimables Croniques*: Marty-Laveaux concludes that Rabelais "refit une facétie traditionnelle"¹⁰ for the publisher, and M. Lefranc grants that "peut-être il l'a relue pour lui, et un peu arrangée et corrigée."¹¹ M. Lefranc's opinion on this point has, therefore, notably changed since he wrote *Les Navigations de Pantagruel*.¹²

In spite of the charm of M. Lefranc's exposition, we hesitate at times to follow him. We are willing to grant that Grandgousier and Gargamelle had to a certain extent the grandparents of Rabelais as prototypes, and that they lived at La Devinière.¹³ We are willing to accept the deduction that Rabelais was born at La Devinière, près de Chinon,¹⁴ and not at Chinon as we had good reason to believe.¹⁵

³ Ch. VI, n. 29.

⁷ Intro., p. lviii.

⁸ Cf. M. Lefranc in *RER.*, 1904, pp. 291-292.

⁹ Ch. XX, n. 24.

¹⁰ Vol. v, p. xxiv; cf. Vol. iv, pp. 19 and ff.

¹¹ Intro., p. xlii.

¹² P. 194, n.

¹³ Intro., p. lv.

¹⁴ Intro., p. cxxviii under [1494].

¹⁵ Marty-Laveaux, Vol. v, p. v (1902).

¹ *Œuvres de Rabelais*, éd. Marty-Laveaux, Vol. i, p. v.

⁴ The 1537 edition published at Lyons (C), is found to be only a reprint of B.

⁵ Cf. Vol. iv, p. 83.

But we cannot get far enough away from the familiar story to admit that Grandgousier and Gargamelle were not giants.¹⁶ The "à peine trois ou quatre traits" given in the foot note, would alone be ample indications that they were quite out of the pale of ordinary mortals. But was not the famous mule with a tail alone more than seventy feet long and twelve feet square, sent in three boats from over seas as a present to Grandgousier (I, xvi)? Did not even the cabbage and lettuce in his garden grow so tall that men could hide in them (I, xxxviii)? In short, could any woman but a giantess give birth through the ear to a child that required to feed him the milk of 17,913 cows? The fact that Grandgousier is represented "se chauffant à un beau, clair et grand feu, recevant ses amis, ou buvant ou dînant ou priant dans son lit,"¹⁷ does not militate in the slightest against his being a giant.

Again, we are willing to admit that Rabelais made a visit to the scenes of his childhood before he began to write his Gargantua, and that this accounts for the Gargantua's offering "un caractère presque exclusivement chinonais";¹⁸ that it was after this visit that he inserted in the second edition of his Pantagruel¹⁹ the speech of Panurge "en langage lanternois," in which are mentioned Gravot, Chavigny, la Pomardièrre, la Devinière and [Ci]nays, but we find it difficult to make out that "le second livre ne renferme aucune allusion aux gens ni aux choses du pays de l'Auteur."²⁰ The still popular designation of Touraine as "le jardin de France" is in this second book.²¹ In the second²² speech of Panurge in the "languaige des antipodes," *Chinon* can be read quite as plainly as the above villages in the sixth speech. According to the map of the Chinonais,²³ Gravot and Chavigny are about three times as far from La Devinière as Chinon is. It may be

recalled also that the gesture made by the Englishman while arguing is designated by its name "en Chinonnoys."²⁴

The Chronology²⁵ of the life of Rabelais presents many dates of references to Rabelais, or to persons and events connected with him, that have rewarded recent research workers. A comparison, however, with the dates given in the biography of Rabelais by Marty-Laveaux (-Huguet)²⁶ reveals but two important differences.²⁷ Marty-Laveaux gives the date of Rabelais' entering Saint-Maur-les-Fossés as 1540, whereas M. Clouzot finds that in 1536 Rabelais "figure parmi les chanoines prébendés de Saint-Maur." M. Clouzot also makes Rabelais resign his two curacies Jan. 9, 1553, instead of 1552.²⁸

M. Sainéan, in the philological notes, endeavors to call attention to all words coined by Rabelais, whether preserved in modern French or not. Such other words as are not to be found in the *Dictionnaire Général*, he attempts to replace "dans leur milieu et à leur époque."²⁹ It would be little short of miraculous if in so difficult a task all grounds for criticism had been avoided. The note³⁰ on *ou* (ou dialogue de Platon) ends: "La forme nasalisée *on* de la variante B est isolée et particulière à R." Does this mean that *on* is only found in B? But a little farther on, we read it in the text before us (E).³¹ Or, does it mean that *on*, in whatever text found, is peculiar to R? But Godefroy gives many examples of its use. Le *Psautier de Metz* alone abounds in them.³² There had even been a tendency in the literary language to confound the sounds *ou* and *on*. Christine de Pisan, for example,

²⁴ Bk. II, ch. XIX.

²⁵ Intro., pp. cxxviii-cxliii.

²⁶ Vol. v, pp. iii-xxxvii.

²⁷ The date 1539, which M-L names (p. xxvii), as the year R. took his "licence en médecine" is evidently a typographical error, as, later on (p. xxxi), 1537 is given.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. xxxv.

²⁹ Intro., p. cxxvi.

³⁰ Prol., l. 2, n. 6.

³¹ Ch. V, l. 3.

³² " . . . ne li pechour on conseil des justes, *Ps.*, I, v. 6, etc.

¹⁶ Intro., p. lvii.

¹⁷ Intro., p. lvi.

¹⁸ Intro., p. xii.

¹⁹ Ch. IX.

²⁰ Intro., p. xii.

²¹ Ch. IX.

²² *Ibid.*

²³ Intro., p. lxxv.

rimes moult: mont;³³ *demonstre: loustre*;³⁴ *Longis: lougis*.³⁵ The note³⁶ on *es* (=en les) seems still less satisfactory: "R. prend *es* dans ce passage (*semblable es Silenes*) et quelques autres (cf. l. 65 *pensast es allegories*) au sens de *aux*; il l'emploie généralement (cf. l. 5: *es bouticques*) au sens étymologique 'en les, dans les' (de même que Marot, Amyot et Montaigne)." But the use of *es* for *aux* is not a mere caprice of Rabelais. Godefroy gives examples of *es*, where to-day *aux* would be used, similar to every case in which R. so uses it. Oresme, the able translator of Charles V, writes: "Ils ressemblent *es* figures de notre temps."³⁷ As for *en* with *penser*, it had not only been occasionally used thus from early times,³⁸ but Marot, in his *Adieu aux Dames*, says: "Mais en ses amours pensera." The construction is still found in the seventeenth century.³⁹ It would seem more desirable to make such notes as these specific than to devote so much space to words in which the only difference from the modern form, is the presence of *ou* for *o* or vice-versa.⁴⁰

*Quel*⁴¹ is noted as a Latinism for *tel* in line ten of the Prologue, ". . . *aultres telles pinctures* . . . (*quel fut Silene* . . .)," and the words added: "pas d'autre emploi chez R." We shall be interested therefore in seeing how *quelles* is construed in the sentence: "C'est un poisson . . . ayant *aesles cartilagineuses* (*quelles sont es Souriz chaulves*), etc."⁴²

Of the words that call for remark we note only one that appears to have been overlooked: *dont*⁴³ introducing a sentence, in the sense of

C'est pourquoi;⁴⁴ or *a propos de quoi*.⁴⁵ The note on *dont*, interrogative,⁴⁶ seems incomprehensible: "*Dont* par suite de la prononciation fermée de l'*o* nasal se confondait alors avec *d'où*; il n'y avait pas de distinction rigoureuse entre *dont* pronom relatif et *dont* interrogatif." *Dont* from earliest times was used both as relative and interrogative.⁴⁷ The simple fact to be noted is that *d'où* had not yet supplanted *dont* as an interrogative. Maupas' Grammar (1607) still gives *dont* by the side of *d'où*.⁴⁸

The closing sentence of note 7, Chapter IX, appears to be misplaced. After a discussion of the word *trepelu*, in which an example of its use is cited from a "*sermon joyeux du XV^e s.*," we read: "*C'est sans doute à Grenoble que R. a entendu ce mot qu'on rencontre pour la première fois en français dans ce passage de Gargantua.*" In note 47, Chapter X, the word *analogie* is said to be a "néologisme introduit par R." Alain Chartier used the word a century before Rabelais: "Si dy que toutes noz atentes mondaines sont appellees Esperance par analogie."⁴⁹ Note 35 of Chapter XII reads: "*Le son oi s'est changé dès la fin du XV^e s. en ouè; de là les notations qu'on lit chez R.*" etc. But at the very beginning of the century Christine de Pisan, for example, writes *mirouer*;⁵⁰ *dourtouer: refectouer: lavouer: parlouer*.⁵¹

The purely philological notes in this volume, form but a small part of the total number (1690). Many of them are digests of articles in the *RER.*, to which frequent reference is made. It is perhaps worth while to call attention to note 54 of Chapter VI. As the statement is made without further remark that "*R. n'est donc pas d'accord avec la mythologie traditionnelle en faisant sortir Castor et Pollux du même oeuf*," it has possibly escaped notice that Rabelais follows in this Jean Lemaire

³³ *Dit de la Pastoure*, l. 53.

³⁴ *Debat*, l. 1479.

³⁵ *Œuvres poét.*, Vol. III, p. 24, l. 201.

³⁶ *Prol.*, l. 5, n. 8.

³⁷ Cited by Godefroy under the def. art. *le*.

³⁸ Cf. "Mais en la lei de nostre Seigneur la volunté de lui, et en la sue lei purpenserat par jurn e par nuit." *Psalt. gal. vetus*, I, v. 2.

³⁹ Cf. Haase, *Syntaxe du XVII^e s.*, p. 359.

⁴⁰ Cf. *Prol.*, n. 33, 69, 122; Ch. I, n. 33; Ch. II, n. 3, 6, 22; Ch. VII, n. 4; Ch. VIII, n. 91; Ch. X, n. 7; Ch. XV, n. 3; Ch. XVII, n. 47.

⁴¹ N. 13.

⁴² Bk. IV, Ch. 3.

⁴³ Ch. VI, l. 37; Ch. VII, l. 7.

⁴⁴ Trans. of Huguet, *Pages choisis de R.*, p. 11.

⁴⁵ Trans. of Marty-Laveaux, Vol. v, p. 210.

⁴⁶ Ch. I, l. 2, n. 3.

⁴⁷ Cf. Tobler, *Vermischte Beiträge*, Vol. III, p. 39.

⁴⁸ P. 340.

⁴⁹ *Li Livre de l'Esperance*, éd. DuChesne, p. 328.

⁵⁰ *Œuvres poét.*, Vol. III, p. 4.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, *Dit de Poissy*, l. 324; see also Meyer-Lübke, *Hist. Gr. der frz. Spr.*, Vol. I, § 83.

de Belges and Boccaccio: . . . *et luy fait pondre deux enfans*⁵² *à diverses fois: C'est-à-dire luy fait faire quatre enfans à deux portees: dont de lune nasquirent Castor et Pollux freres jumeaux: et de l'autre Heleine et Clytemnestre, sœurs jumelles selon l'opinion de Boccace.*⁵³

LUOY M. GAY.

University of Wisconsin.

Histoire illustrée de la littérature française, précis méthodique, par E. ABRY, C. AUDIC, P. CROUZET. Paris: Didier, 1912. xii + 664 pp.

MM. Abry, Audic, and Crouzet, teachers in French lycées, have produced an admirable manual of French literature. Their work has already begun to supersede a number of similar books at present in use in American high-schools and colleges, and fully deserves to do so. Dominated by the ideas of M. Lanson, it should occupy in the elementary teaching of French a position similar to that which the more profound and extensive work of the Professor of French literature at the Sorbonne holds in advanced and graduate work.

The authors describe their work as a "précis essentiellement réaliste." It has two distinctive characteristics, the substitution of historical for aesthetic criticism, and the systematic use of illustrations. MM. Abry, Audic, and Crouzet dispense with the subtle analyses of individual style and the elaborate comparisons of different writers which are common in literary histories, though of value chiefly to readers familiar with the authors discussed. They substitute information much more profitable to the students for whom the present hand-book is intended, abundant biographical details, brief but illuminating extracts and outlines, and helpful sketches of literary connections and historical background.

In analyzing literary traits and tendencies,

the authors attempt a purely objective treatment. In so doing they permit the skeleton of their work to obtrude itself upon the reader with somewhat excessive insistence. In discussing Alfred de Vigny, for example (pp. 514-5), they point out with all the emphasis of very black type that his character had *three* principal qualities: "1. La tristesse;" "2. L'orgueil;" "3. La pitié." Similarly, his literary theories are summarized under "1. L'impersonnalité," and "2. Le symbole." Under each of these headings extracts are given in illustration of the statements made. At first sight this system appears mechanical and dogmatic, but more careful examination shows that the context softens the harshness of the outline, and that the extracts lend it life and meaning. Upon the whole, though the attempt to abstain from aesthetic criticism has been carried out with some exaggeration, the step taken in this direction is distinctly to be commended.

Like a number of other text-books issued by the same publisher, the book is remarkable for the large number (324) and the excellence of its illustrations. M. Crouzet, who was responsible for this part of the book, gives evidence of taste and judgment. Though the small size of the reproductions makes them in some cases difficult to appreciate—the legends of M. Crouzet frequently call attention to details that are scarcely visible—yet the freshness, variety, and helpfulness of the pictures are worthy of all praise. A student who sees a page reproduced from Montaigne's printed copy of his *Essais*, with numerous manuscript corrections (p. 108), or from Racine's Greek text of Aeschylus, with careful annotations in Racine's own hand (p. 244), gains a definite and useful appreciation of the way in which the masterpieces of French literature developed. *Préciosité* and the funeral orations of Bossuet are brought measurably nearer to one who sees the *Carte du Tendre* (p. 136) and an excellent picture of the funeral of Henriette d'Angleterre (p. 260).

The taste of the writers of the history, to judge from their inclusions and exclusions as well as their characterizations, is in general very good. As is to be expected in a school book, certain sides of French literature are de-

⁵² The ms. of Geneva reads *eufz*; cf. *Œuvres de J. L. de B.*, p. p. J. Stecher, 1882, Vol. 2, p. 22.

⁵³ *Illustrations de la Gaule*, Bk. II, Ch. ii.